

# The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor  
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor  
CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher  
Editorial Rooms and Business Office 324-330 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00  
Six Months......50  
In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75  
Three Months..... .25  
Single Copy..... .05  
Sample Copies Free.  
Foreign Post. 5c Extra.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS** can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

**DISCONTINUANCES**—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year.

**PRESENTATION COPIES**—Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

**RENEWALS**—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '10, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1910. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

**CHANGE OF ADDRESS**—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

**ADVERTISING**—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

**THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.**

the welfare of the general public, Roosevelt declared:

"But the supreme court of the United States possessed, and unfortunately exercised, the negative power of not permitting the abuse to be remedied. By a five to four vote they declared the action of the state of New York unconstitutional, because, forsooth, man must not be deprived of his liberty to work under unhygienic conditions."

But if Roosevelt borrowed of Bryan at Denver, he fairly gobbled him up at Osawatimie, Kan.

In his Osawatimie speech, Roosevelt announced his platform under which he promises to restore this nation of ours to something of the genuine prosperity of pre-trust days. As the first and greatest plank of that platform Roosevelt announced:

Eliminate special interests from politics.

So said Bryan as early as 1896, and the republican leaders denounced him as a populist for saying it.

Roosevelt's second plan demands complete publicity of corporation affairs.

A dozen years ago, Bryan made the same demand.

Roosevelt insists loudly in his platform for government supervision of the capitalization of public service and other corporations doing an interstate business; for personal responsibility for officers and directors of corporations which break the law; for increase in the power of the federal bureau of corporations and the interstate commerce to control combinations in industry.

For these Bryan was on record even before Roosevelt was governor of New York.

Roosevelt declared for publicity of campaign contributions before as well as after elections. (He did not do so when, as a candidate for president, he wrote the "Dear Harriman" letter, which brought a contribution of a quarter of a million dollars.)

Two years ago Bryan contended for this very thing, but the Roosevelt-bossed republican party would not listen to the suggestion.

And so we might go on through the many planks of the new Roosevelt order.

Roosevelt lays no claim to heirship to the Bryan policies. He simply takes them over bodily as his own.—San Francisco Star.

## GOOD FOR WAYMAN

Prosecutor Wayman of Chicago need not feel downcast because of the acquittal of Lee O'Neil Browne. Mr. Wayman evidently did his duty well and the attention of Americans generally has been fixed upon his good efforts. A jury's verdict does not always mean the triumph of right nor does it always represent the fixed conclusion reached by the public.

## Democrats and Insurgents Unite

The Ballinger investigating committee decided some time ago to meet at Minneapolis. When the members of the committee began to gather there it seemed likely that Mr. Madison, the insurgent republican from Kansas, would unite with the four democratic members in a report against Ballinger. Standpat republican members, therefore, refused to attend the session, and Senator Nelson, chairman of the committee announced that the meeting would be held Tuesday, September 12, at Chicago. The democrats and the one insurgent from Kansas insisted on holding the Minneapolis meeting and proceeded to make reports. Mr. Madison of Kansas also made a report. The democratic members' report is in brief:

"That Richard A. Ballinger has not been true to the trust reposed in him as secretary of the interior; that he is not deserving of public confidence, and that he should be asked by the proper authorities to resign his office."

The report made by Mr. Madison, insurgent, declares that Mr. Ballinger "should not be retained; that he was an unfaithful trustee of the people's interest, an enemy of conservation," and that the charges of Gifford Pinchot should be sustained.

These findings will be printed and filed with congress.

Following is the Associated Press report of the committee proceedings:

Summarized, the democratic findings declare that the evidence shows:

"That there was no conspiracy against Mr. Ballinger.

"That Gifford Pinchot and L. R. Glavis were faithful trustees of the people's interests.

"That Mr. Ballinger's conduct on certain occasions was intended to and did have the effect of deceiving the president.

"That Mr. Ballinger's action in having 'clear-listed' the so-called Cunningham Alaskan coal lands and ordering them patented showed bad faith.

"That he advocated a bill to validate Alaskan coal claims alleged to be fraudulent.

"That his action in acting as attorney in cases pending in the land office while he was commissioner was reprehensible.

"That he helped to force the Cunningham coal claims to a hearing before the government was ready to proceed.

"That he encouraged insubordination in the reclamation service and condoned improper official conduct in that connection."

Numerous official acts of Ballinger are attacked. High praise is given Gifford Pinchot, former chief forester and L. R. Glavis, former chief of field division of the general land office.

Mr. Madison's conclusions are:

"That the charges of Messrs. Glavis and Pinchot should be sustained.

"That Secretary Ballinger has been unfaithful to the public interests.

"That in the matter of Cunningham coal lands he was not a faithful trustee of the people's interests.

"That with regard to the reclamation service he has taken action tending toward its disintegration."

A resolution adopted by the democrats and Mr. Madison provided for publication of the findings. When Senator Nelson left the committee room, Senator Fletcher was made chairman pro tem. and members proceeded with their work.

The findings of the democrats and Mr. Madison also were filed with the secretary of the committee.

Upon the assembling of the committee, Chairman Nelson said he desired to inform them that Mr. Denby arrived yesterday morning and that Mr. Olmstead would arrive this evening and that he had received word from Senator Root that he could be here next Tuesday. This would, he said, bring together eleven of the twelve members of the committee.

In view of this fact he suggested either of two alternatives, that they agree to meet here next Tuesday, or as Senator Root can reach Chicago Monday, and all but two members of the committee will pass through Chicago on their way home, a meeting of the committee be held in Chicago next Monday, instead of here next Tuesday. Mr. Nelson said he was exceedingly anxious to dispose of the matter at the earliest possible moment.

Roll call disclosed that no quorum was present, and Senator Nelson said in view of that fact that no business could be transacted except a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Madison protested against the action of

the chairman as arbitrary and unfair and moved that the absent members of the committee be brought in. The four democrats and Mr. Madison voted for it, Mr. Nelson not voting.

Mr. Nelson declined to put a motion of Mr. James that Ivan Bowen be appointed sergeant-at-arms, on the ground that a quorum was not present and the motion was therefore not in order. Mr. Nelson said Mr. Bowen has not been and is not acting as sergeant-at-arms of the committee.

Mr. Madison then moved that the secretary of the committee be empowered to notify the absentees to appear at the committee room at once, and that upon failure to come he arrest them and bring them in. The motion was adopted by the five members.

Secretary Sleman notified Messrs. Sutherland and Representatives McCall and Denby to appear at the committee room, but declined to execute the order that they be arrested as under the resolution authorizing the investigation there were no such authority.

The three gentlemen mentioned made the following reply:

"In view of the refusal of a minority of the committee on Wednesday to postpone action until the members of the committee known to be coming could arrive at Minneapolis, and their evident purpose to attempt to make the action of a minority the official action of the committee without consideration and their refusal to discuss the evidence at the former meeting, and in view of the fact that at a former meeting they promulgated to the public their decision of the case, which had no validity whatever as official action, and yet amounted to a conclusive judgement of the case as far as said minority were concerned, we insist upon an opportunity for full membership of the committee to decide the case which was committed to them by law and we must therefore decline the invitation of the gentlemen assembled to meet with them today."

Mr. Madison then offered the following resolution:

"That Mr. Sleman be instructed to communicate to Senator Sutherland and Representatives McCall and Denby that the statement that any member or members of the committee refusing to discuss the evidence at issue is absolutely incorrect. If Senator Sutherland and Representatives McCall and Denby had remained in the committee room, as was their duty, we would have then discussed the evidence and today be discussing the evidence if they desired, and are willing now to discuss it; that in view of the fact they left the room without any request to discuss the evidence, and in view of the fact that the chairman's stand that discussion was in order and they did not attempt to discuss the case, or indicate a desire to do so, we feel it is their duty now to come into the meeting and deliberate upon the evidence if they desire to discuss it, and that the members who are present will gladly discuss with them any matter pending before the committee. No report has been formulated and the question of what the report shall contain is a matter now for deliberation and discussion."

Senator Nelson said he was of the opinion that inasmuch as a quorum of the committee was not present the only motion for business that could be entertained under parliamentary law was either a motion to adjourn or motions to secure attendance of the committee. He said that inasmuch as the motion just offered related to the matter of securing the attendance of members of the committee, the chair, in that view, would put the motion. The five members voted for it.

Mr. Madison moved to take a recess until 2:30 o'clock and the motion was seconded by Mr. James. The chairman repeated that there was no quorum, and that the motion therefore was not in order.

Mr. Madison asked if the chair held that only a motion to adjourn sine die could be considered at this time. Mr. Nelson said he would not object to some one else putting the motion, but he thought it was not in order and he would not himself put it. He based his refusal on the ground that a quorum not being present, the only two motions that could be entertained were motions to adjourn and to compel the attendance of absent members.

The discussion revolved about parliamentary usage, in which the members sought to commit the chairman to an expression of opinion. Mr.